Interview Summary	Application N	lo.	Applicant(s)	
	10/001,307		RASMUSSEN ET AL.	
	Examiner		Art Unit	
	Jeffrey Siew		1637	
All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):				
(1) Jeffrey Siew.	(3)			
(2) <u>Christopher Gramm</u> .	(4)			
Date of Interview: 02 March 2004.				
Type: a)☐ Telephonic b)☐ Video Conference c)☐ Personal [copy given to: 1)☐ applicant 2)☐ applicant's representative]				
Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No. If Yes, brief description:				
Claim(s) discussed: 45 and 46.				
Identification of prior art discussed: Wang et al (US6,468,785) & Keen (6,060,327).				
Agreement with respect to the claims f)⊠ was reached. g)□ was not reached. h)□ N/A.				
Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: <u>discussed and agreed to examiner's amendment</u> . Also discussed Wang et al and Keen. Neither each or suggest shrinking substrate or a topological surface area greater than projected surface area.				
(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amer allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attach	copy of the ame			
THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.				
Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.		Examiner's sign	ature, if required	<u> </u>